THE [John Williams Bp of Chichester]

Protestant's Answer

TO THE

Catholick Letter

TO THE

SEEKER:

OR, A

VINDICATION

OF THE

PROTESTANT's ANSWER,

To the *SEEKER*'s Request.

IMPRIMATUR,

Liber cui Titulus, [*The Protestant's Answer to the Catholick Letter to the Seeker*, &c.]

Maii 22. 1688.

H. Maurice RR. in Christo P. D. *Wilhelmo* Archiep. *Cant.* à Sacris.

LONDON, Printed and are to be Sold by *Randal Taylor*, near *Stationers-Hall*, M.DC.LXXXVIII.

THE CONTENTS.

THE matter in debate stated p. 2.
The Sum of the Protestant Answer p. 4.
Transubstantiation confest by many of the Church of Rome not to be proved by Scripture, pag. 5.
Joh. 6. 48. consider'd, p. 6.
Not for Transubstantiation, by the confession of several in the Church of Rome, Ibid.
It's also proved by several Arguments.
As that place had no special reference to the Sacrament, p. 7.
Eating the Flesh then spoken of, may be out of the Sacrament as well as in it, Ibid.
Proved to concern those present as well as others. p. 8.
The sense of eating the Flesh of Christ proved to be Figurative, p. 10.
Of Figurative Speeches, p. 12.
Particularly here, p. 13, &c.
Of Christ's being a Vine, &c. p. 17.
The words, This is my Body, considered, p. 18.
Of the word This, p. 22.
Of Christ's being in the Sacrament after a Spiritual manner, Ibid.
The Texts produced by Protestants for it, p. 24.
1. The Letter of Scripture for the Protestant Doctrine, p. 26.
(1.) Where it's call'd Bread, and the Fruit of the Vine.
(2.) The

The Contents.

(2.) *The Body of Christ had the Natural properties of a Body,* p. 29.
(3.) *The Body of Christ is in Heaven, and circumscribed,* p. 32.
(4.) *That Christ's Body is Glorified, and so not a Sacrifice,* p. 33.
2. *The words which are Figurative, are for us, such are these,* This is my Body, Ibid.

THE

THE PROTESTANT's ANSWER TO THE CATHOLICK LETTER TO THE SEEKER, &c.

HEre's a *Catholick Letter to the Seeker, or a Reply to the Protestant Answer to the Seeker.* But what's become of the *Seeker* himself, for this four Months past? What of the *Declaration* he was in the Conclusion to make for the *Catholick Faith* of *Rome*, which we are now told of? That according to the method, it seems agreed on, he may, after *Sentence pass'd* in this case, *proceed to the Infallibility of the Church, or other Points of Faith in difference betwixt them and the Church of* England; as our Author intimates there a little too early. The *Seeker* had indeed given reason enough to judg on which side he was to be satisfied: That tho seemingly he was sent out like the Dove, to try where he might find rest for the Sole of his Foot, yet we may see beforehand, what was the Ark he was to return to; and that they were as sure of him, as they are of a Convert before they offer a Conference. Where's now the Resolution he was to come to? Has the *Protestant Answer to the Seekers Request*, broke these Measures, and forced them to think of another Expedient? Our Author cannot altogether dissemble it. It seems the *Seeker* was to put certain *Ties* upon his Answerers, to which his Friend on the side of the Church of *Rome*

Cath. Letter to a Seeker, p. 1. and 34.

 submit-

ſubmitted, and it was humbly conceived the Proteſtant Anſwerer would have done ſo too, as our Author ſignifies, p. 1. But he being a lover of Liberty more than Courtſhip; and of Truth, and Reaſon more than both, took upon himſelf, as its thought, too much Authority, when together with his Anſwer to the *Seekers Requeſt*, he wrote a Reply to the *Catholick Anſwer to the Seekers Requeſt*. This is a courſe our Author complains of, and perhaps he has ſome reaſon for it. But what has he to accuſe the *Proteſtant Anſwerer* of? That *he has evaded the Queſtion*. As how? Of this he gives a threefold Inſtance.

1. That he has uſed the Word *Tranſubſtantiation*. Of this our Author thus complains, *p.* 2. and 5. *I do not find the word* Tranſubſtantiation, *ſo much as mentioned in either your Requeſt, or my Anſwer. Wherefore, how ſincere the Gentleman has been in this particular, let the World judg.* A material Point! who would not think now, that the word *Tranſubſtantiation* was abominated by him, and as little uſed in their Church, as it is in ours? It's fit therefore to know our Authors mind in it. Of this he ſaith, *It's a word deviſed by the Church to expreſs the Converſion that's made in the Sacrament, — and which myſterious change the Holy Catholick* [the Roman] *Church doth properly call* Tranſubſtantiation, *p.* 2, and 5. Now, where is the fault? Where the inſincerity? The inſincerity they may take to themſelves; but the fault is, that when they thought by the uſe of the Phraſe, *Real Preſence*, common to both them and us, and by the forbearance of the word *Tranſubſtantiation*, which is peculiar to themſelves, that they might have impoſed upon the unwary Reader, the *Proteſtant Anſwerer uſed the word* Tranſubſtantiation for their Real Preſence, and ſo their deſign is diſcover'd, and in part defeated.

2. He ſaith, The *Proteſtant Anſwerer* evaded the Queſtion, when *inſtead of ſpeaking to the* Real Preſence, *he betook himſelf to* Tranſubſtantiation, *p.* 2. Now, who would not think upon this charge, that his *Real Preſence* and *Tranſubſtantiation*, are as inconſiſtent as Truth and Falſhood? Here indeed he has put a Queſtion, which I confeſs I ſhould have been ready to ask; *What's this to the purpoſe? Is not the* Real Preſence *and* Tranſubſtantiation *all as one? p.* 5. And I ſhould be as ready to ask again, If they *are all as one*, how was the Queſtion evaded, when *inſtead of ſpeaking to the* Real Preſence, *the Anſwerer betook himſelf to* Tranſubſtantiation?

ſubſtantiation? In this, he thus acutely Anſwers. *No truly, they are not all as one, as you may think. For there is a great deal of difference betwixt a Man, and the Name by which he is diſtinguiſhed.*---*'Tis one thing to prove the* Real Preſence, *and being of Chriſts Body and Blood in the Sacrament; and another to ſhew, why this change is by the Church call'd* Tranſubſtantiation; *tho whoever believes the one, can't in Truth deny the other.* That is, the *Real Preſence* and *Tranſubſtantiation*, are not *all as one*, becauſe they are *all as one*: And the *Anſwerer* has evaded the Queſtion, by uſing the one for the other, becauſe *whoever believes the one, can't in Truth deny the other.*

3. But he has not yet concluded the Charge. For ſaith he, *Whereas the Controverſy is not about the word*, the Anſwerer has *altogether banter'd at the word* Tranſubſtantiation, *and not ſpoken to the Subſtance*, p. 5. So before, *The* Arians *with as much reaſon might have objected againſt the word* Conſubſtantial (*which was deviſed againſt them*) *as the Proteſtant Anſwerer has done, where* p. 3. he ſays, "*That it's enough for them to ſhew that* Tranſubſtantiation *is not* "*taught in Scripture, tho the Being of Chriſts Body and Blood in the* "*Sacrament is,*—p. 2. If our Author's skill in reaſoning be no better than it appears to be in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, his Adverſary has no great reaſon to fear him. That the word *Conſubſtantial* was uſed againſt the *Arians*, I acknowledg; but that it was deviſed againſt them (as our Author ſaith) is ſpoken at adventure. For the contrary is evident that it was in uſe long before in the Chriſtian Church. So ſaith *Euſebius*, *We have known certain Learned and Famous Biſhops and Writers among the Ancients, who reaſoning upon the Divinity of the Father and Son, have uſed the word* Conſubſtantial, or ὁμοούσιος. Eccl. Hiſt. l. 1. c. 8.

But to return to the Charge; where is this Controverſy managed in the Anſwer about this unſcriptural word *Tranſubſtantiation*, which the Proteſtant Anſwerer *altogether banter'd at?* He has found it out in ſomewhat that is not there; I ſhall here ſet down the Words of the *Anſwer*, with his, and let's ſee how they agree,

Cath. Letter, p. 2.	*Proteſtant Anſwerer*, p. 3.
He [the Proteſtant Anſwerer] *ſays, That 'tis enough for them to ſhew that* Tranſubſtantiation *is not taught in Scripture, tho the Being of Chriſts*	'Tis enough for us to ſhew, that *Tranſubſtantiation* is not taught in Scripture, and that thoſe that pretend 'tis there, cannot ſhew it; nay, that the

Body and Blood in the Sacrament is. literal Senſe concludes not for it; and that our notion of the *Real Preſence*, is agreeable to it.

Where this Author is guilty of a double Perverſion. Firſt, That he tranſlates what is ſpoken of *Tranſubſtantiation* in the notion, to the Word (when there is not a Syllable that looks, that way) and then, that he would repreſent the *Real Preſence* in the Proteſtant, that is a ſpiritual, Senſe, to be an acknowledgment of *the Being of Chriſts Body and Blood in the Sacrament*, in their way.

But after our Author has for ſome Pages entertain'd himſelf in managing this imaginary diſpute againſt his Adverſary, yet in Confutation of himſelf he finds out another ſort of matter that he is obliged to conſider, and if he can, to confute.

The *Proteſtant Anſwer* conſiſts of two Parts.

In the firſt, are conſidered the Texts produced in the *Catholick Anſwer to the Seeker*, to prove their *Real Preſence*, which I hope I may now call *Tranſubſtantiation.*

In the ſecond, There is given a Catalogue of ſuch Texts, as maintain the Proteſtant Doctrine of Chriſts Spiritual Preſence, and in Confutation of the Corporal Preſence held in the Church of *Rome.* And now let us view our Author's Undertaking, and ſee how he has quitted himſelf in both of theſe.

PART I. Sect. 1.

Part. 1. Sect. 1.

WE are to conſider in the firſt place, how our Author has Vindicated his own Anſwer to the *Seekers Requeſt*, and what Reply there is made to the Objections and Arguments directed againſt his pretended Proofs from Scripture.

In the entrance upon this matter, the *Proteſtant Anſwerer* ſuggeſted, that the *Seeker* had put an unreaſonable Task upon his *Catholick Prieſts*, to prove their *Real Preſence*, or *Tranſubſtantiation, by the expreſs Text, and plain Word of God*; ſince Perſons of the greateſt Note, for Quality and Learning, in their Church, have freely given it up, and granted it to be a vain attempt. Such as

as *Scotus* and *Biel*, among the Schoolmen, and the Cardinals, *Alliaco*, *Fiſher*, *Cajetan* and *Bellarmin*. What ſaith our Author to this?

Firſt, ſaith he, Suppoſing it was ſo as theſe Authors ſay, That "*there is not one place of Scripture ſo expreſs, that without the "Determination of the Church, it would evidently compel a Man to "receive* Tranſubſtantiation. — *Yet the ſame might as well be ſaid of the Conſubſtantiality of the Son*, p. 3. Will our Author venture to ſay, there is no more from Scripture to prove the Conſubſtantiality of the Son, than there is to prove *Tranſubſtantiation?* Or hath he any heart to ſay it, after the publiſhing *the Doctrine of the Trinity and Tranſubſtantiation compared*, and as long as that Book lies unanſwered? But let that be as it will. *What*, ſaith he, *is this to the Being, or not Being of the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Sacrament? Had he produced* Scotus, Bellarmin, *&c. to diſprove the* Real Preſence, *it had been ſomething, tho not to your purpoſe. For the Requeſt was to ſatisfie you by Scripture only, and not by citing our Modern Divines, &c. but by the expreſs Text, &c.* But I think it was to the purpoſe to ſhew that ſome of the moſt Eminent in their Church declare it is not to be proved in that way, and I think to declare it cannot be proved, is little better than to *diſprove it.*

At laſt our Author is content to yield up *Scotus*, one of his *Modern Divines*, and *Bellarmin*; and he adds, *if what they have ſaid in that matter, will do the Gentleman a kindneſs, he ſhall have it not only from them, but all the Faithful.* If ſo, I fear our Author then will be left alone; for if *all the Faithful* are of the ſame mind with *Scotus* and *Bellarmin*; then his Undertaking to prove *Tranſubſtantiation* by the *expreſs Texts of* Scripture, will be a fruitleſs Attempt. But we go too far, for that's to be underſtood with a reſerve, *viz.* Scripture *without the Determination of the Church is not ſo expreſs*, &c. This premiſed, our Author cheerfully proceeds, *That altho the Scripture were never ſo plain, we would yet ſubmit to the Determination of the Church, for the true Senſe and Meaning thereof.* So that tho he pleads Scripture, and would fain find out ſomewhat that looks like an *expreſs Text*; yet he doth it not, nor would be underſtood, *that he thereby renounced the Determination of the Church.* For whether the Scripture be *plain* for it or not, is not the Foot this matter reſts upon; and *altho it were never ſo plain*, yet the Church is to give it the *true*

meaning; and whatever meaning the Church gives it, that is the *true meaning*; and ſo, if the Church had determined againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, as it has determined for it, there would have been ſtill expreſs *Texts*, and the caſe had been alike reſolved.

SECT. II.

Sect. 2. AT laſt we are come to the main ſeat of the Controverſie, *p.6.* The *Catholick Anſwerer* had produced two places of Scripture as his *plain Texts* for *Tranſubſtantiation*; the firſt is, *Joh.6.48.* Here the *Proteſtant Anſwerer* interpoſed, and firſt directed the *Seeker*, where he might find about thirty Writers of the *Roman* Church, who reject that Text as not ſerving to our *Author*'s purpoſe, *Pag.* 4. and then proceeds to ſhew for what reaſons they and we do ſo reject it.

Arg. 1. As it had no ſpecial reference to the Sacrament; and that for two Reaſons: 1. Becauſe this Diſcourſe of our Saviour was delivered above a year before, *ver.* 4.

To this firſt our Author replies,

That the fourth Verſe, [*The Paſſover, a Feaſt of the Jews, was nigh*] *is no Rule to ſhew the Sacrament was not inſtituted above a year after.* For, ſaith he, *that this word* Nigh *ſhould ſignifie above a year after, is ſuch a Figure as never was:* And ſo gravely repairs to his Concordance to prove the word *Nigh* is *not by expreſs and plain Scripture to be taken for above a year after.* Certainly there was never more need of *expreſs and plain Scripture*, when men cannot look a Chapter or two before them. For would any one that was converſant in the Goſpels, think that St. *John* here, and St. *Luke* 22. 1. muſt needs ſpeak of the ſame Paſſover, becauſe St. *Luke hath the ſame word, Now the Feaſt of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is call'd the Paſſover.* I ſee our Author wants here a little information. Let him therefore turn to *Chap.7.v.2,&* 14. and he will find a Feaſt of Tabernacles; and go on to *Chap.* 13. 1. and he will find another Paſſover. Now I hope I need not acquaint him that theſe two Feaſts of the Tabernacles and Paſſover were kept in different Months, and that the ſame Paſſover could not be before and after the Feaſt of Tabernacles; and conſequently, it muſt be a year betwixt the Paſſover, *Joh.6.4.* and that *Joh.13.1.* and as much *above a year* betwixt our Saviour's Diſcourſe, *Joh.6.* and the Paſſover, as that was before the approaching Paſſover that was ſaid to be *Nigh.*

2. The *Proteſtant Anſwerer* proceeded to ſhew that this Diſcourſe of our Saviour had no ſpecial reference to the Sacrament, becauſe *the eating the Fleſh, and drinking the Blood here ſpoken of, might be out of the Sacrament as well as in it, and at that preſent as well as a year after.* This he proved from *Verſ.* 53, 54, 56, 57. In all which the preſent time is ſtill ſpoken of, *Except ye eat. He that eateth.—My fleſh is meat.*

To this our Author replies:

To ſay, *That the fleſh of Chriſt may be eaten out of the Sacrament, and even before it was inſtituted, &c. is indeed ſuch a Figure, as none but himſelf can unriddle,* p. 8.

I anſwer, But to ſay (as he doth) *that Chriſt would give us bread to eat in the Sacrament, which ſhould be the very ſame fleſh which he would, and afterwards did give for the life of the world,* that is, that he ſhould give it before it was given, is a *Figure* I doubt our Author *himſelf* cannot *unriddle*; who ſaith again, that *before he gave it, 'twas impoſſible for them to eat it*; but he gave it not, till he gave it on the Croſs.

(2) But to ſay that the Fleſh of Chriſt *here ſpoken of* (an Expoſition our Author left out) might be eaten out of the Sacrament, as well as in it, is no Riddle, if it be true. And it is true if our Saviour ſpoke here of his Fleſh that might be, and was then to be eaten, at the ſame time as he ſpoke it, by all thoſe that were then his preſent Auditors; as the Anſwerer proved from verſes 53, 54, &c.

To this our Author oppoſes *verſ.* 5. *The Bread which I will give is my fleſh,* &c. *Where,* ſaith he, *Chriſt promiſed, and told them before that he would (in the Future Tenſe) give them bread to eat, which ſhould be the very ſame fleſh, which he would, and afterwards did, give for the life of the world.* Whence he infers, *If the bread which he in the Sacrament gives us to eat, ſaying, Take, Eat, This is my Body, be not that Bread which he promiſed he would give us to eat, pray ask your Proteſtant Anſwerer, where, when, and how did Chriſt give us Bread to eat, which ſhould be his fleſh, if this be not?* Pag. 7. What is a little out of its place, in our Author, I have here laid together, that I may give it its full force:

To this I anſwer:

1. I readily own with our Author, that the words, *I will give,* contain a promiſe, but then we differ about the time when they were fulfilled. He ſaith, they refer to his *laſt Supper, when he took Bread,*

Bread, &c. under the *Forms of Bread and Wine*. But now if I am examined upon the *Where*, the *When*, and the *How*, I ſhould refer it to the Croſs; and that becauſe of the following words, *The Bread which I will give is my Fleſh, which I will give for the life of the world*. For he gave not his Fleſh *for the life of the world* in the Sacrament, but after the inſtitution of that, on the Croſs; not under the *Forms of Bread and Wine*, but in his own proper *Form*, and viſible to the Spectators. The reaſon of his miſtake ſeems to be, that he reads the Future Tenſe after this manner, our Saviour *told them that he would give them Bread to eat, which ſhould be his Fleſh*. Where he is guilty of two over-ſights. Firſt, that he applies that to the Future which is ſpoken of the Preſent, for he reads it *ſhould be his Fleſh*, as if it was firſt Bread, and then was to be Fleſh, to put the better colour upon their Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*; whereas our Saviour ſaith, the Bread *is my Fleſh*, which is directly againſt it; and if it ſignifies any thing of that nature, would rather prove that his Fleſh ſhould be Bread. For it's not ſaid, the Bread which I will give ſhall be my Fleſh, but rather that which is my Fleſh, I will give to be Bread.

2, He alters the Terms of the Text, for the words are, *Which I will give for the life of the world*; and he reads them, *Which I will give them to Eat:* as if the promiſe refer'd only to the Bread which they ſhould eat; and not to the Fleſh which was to be given for the world. So that we ſee what's like to become of his Queſtion, he prays his *Seeker* to ask his Proteſtant Anſwerer, viz. *Where, When and How did Chriſt give us Bread to eat which ſhould be his Fleſh, if this be it not* in the Sacrament? For he muſt frame his Queſtion anew, if he would have it to the purpoſe; and muſt read St. *John* again (notwithſtanding what he ſaith he has done on *this occaſion*, Pag 8.) and whatever he found before, I am apt to think after this little light given to him, he will not find thoſe words in this Chapter, *He would give them Bread to eat, which ſhould be his Fleſh*. And if he reads the *Proteſtant Anſwer* again, he will find no occaſion for thoſe words, *Where*, &c. *if this be it not?* For the *Anſwerer* did not except the Sacrament, and ſay the eating the Fleſh, and drinking the Blood here ſpoken of, could not be in the Sacrament, but that it might be out of the Sacrament as well as in it; intimating thereby that it was not to be underſtood in a ſenſe peculiar to the Sacrament, but in a ſenſe common to that and other Offices of Religion; and

that

that *eating* and *drinking* were (as he ſhew'd) but other words for *coming* and *believing*.

3. But our Author has a further reſerve, and offers at a peculiar Expoſition of thoſe Phraſes, I ſuppoſe it's (in his phraſe *p.* 2.) *his private meaning* of v. 53, &c. *Except ye eat,—he that eateth. Not*, ſaith he, *that he did then give, or that they did then eat his Fleſh, and drink his Blood, which they could not do before he took it, bleſſed it, brake it, and gave it. For at that time when he ſpake this, he only told them he would give it, and the Eve before his Paſſion, he performed it. And from that time I ſuppoſe the Obligation bears force*, ver. 53. *Except ye eat*, &c.

I will ſuppoſe that the Preſent doth not here exclude the Future, and that he that *eateth my Fleſh, and drinketh my Blood hath Eternal life*, will always hold true, and what all ages as well as thoſe then preſent would partake of; but methinks it's very hard to make the preſent exclude it ſelf, and to tell us that *they did not, and could not then eat the Fleſh of Chriſt*, when our Saviour ſaith they might and ought, as is evident from what follows.

Let us go to the *thing* to be eaten, and it's repreſented in the Preſent Tenſe, *v.* 51. This *is* the Bread. *v.* 51. I *am* the Bread. *v.* 52. *Is* my Fleſh. *v.* 55. My Fleſh *is* meat.

Let us go to the *act*, and in correſpondence to the object, it's alſo in the preſent, *v.* 51. If any man *eat*. Thus the *Jews* underſtood it, *v.* 52. How can this man *give* us his Fleſh to eat? And accordingly our Saviour anſwers, *v.* 53. Except ye *eat*, &c. *ye have* no life in you. He ſpeaks it to thoſe preſent, *ye*; and then applies it univerſally, *v.* 54. *Whoſo eateth my Fleſh*, &c.

Let us go to the thing ſignified by Eating and Drinking, and it's after the ſame manner, *v.* 35. He that *cometh*, and he that *believeth*, *v.* 38, 40, 45, 47.

I ſhall conclude this with what was ſaid in the *Proteſtant Anſwer*. If Chriſt's Fleſh here ſpoken of, might be eaten, and his Blood drank out of the Sacrament, then it could not here be underſtood of that Fleſh and Blood which our Author ſaith the Bread and Wine are converted into in the Sacrament; nor, I may add, of *carnal* eating his Fleſh, and drinking his Blood.

Our Author reſents this ill, for he ſaith, *As to his carnal eating, we beg his pardon, if he means as we eat Beef, and other Meats. For that we truly and really receive the Body and Blood of Chriſt (to uſe his own words) after an Heavenly and Spiritual manner; We ſhould*

agree, did we not differ in this, that they receive it in Figure and Fancy only, and we receive it in Substance and Truth, Pag. 8.

Here I acknowledg I intended no hurt in the world, but thought I had expreſt my ſelf innocently enough. For when I had read in the *Catholick Anſwer*, that *in the Euchariſt is Truly, Really, and Subſtantially contained under the Forms of Bread and Wine, the True Body and Blood of our Lord Jeſus in the very Subſtance wherein he was born of the Virgin, and wherein he lived and died for us, with this difference only, that he was viſible to the eye of Fleſh then, and inviſible to the ſame now.* I thought the word *carnal* was expreſſive of the thing, and indeed I find no great reaſon to alter it: For, 1. had I ſaid *Metaphorically* and *Figuratively*, that by no means would ſuit what is corporal. And beſides, I learn too from our Author, *Pag.* 17. that that is a *deceitful, fictitious* manner. 2. Had I ſaid *corporal*, I ſee little diſtance betwixt that and carnal; for as Body and Fleſh is all one, ſo is corporal and carnal. 3. Had I choſen the word *Spiritual*, that's a kind of contradiction, if applied to a Body; for Spiritual eating of a Body is little better than bodily eating of a ſpirit. And when a *Real Preſence by Faith* would not content them, if *we deny a Real Preſence by ſenſe*, *Seeker*, Pag. 6. I had as much reaſon to believe a Spiritual eating would be no more allowed than a Spiritual Preſence. 4. Had I expreſs'd it by *Heavenly*, when it was ſomewhat eaten and drank corporally, and that what we took with the mouth was the very Body of Chriſt, it could not be ſufficiently expreſſive of it.

It was further urged,

Arg. 2. Upon mature Conſideration of the whole, it appear'd to the *Proteſtant Anſwerer* that the ſenſe of Eating the Fleſh of Chriſt in this place muſt be Figurative, and ſignifies no other than *coming* to Chriſt, and *Believing* in him; which ſure is out of the Sacrament, as well as in it. And this indeed he proved from the promiſcuous uſe of the words in that Chapter; but this our Author conceals from his Reader, that he might not too apparently contradict what he had ſaid, *Pag.* 2. That *he ſays (by no Authority but his own) that the ſenſe of Eating the Fleſh, muſt be Figurative; and right or wrong they are Figurative*, upon *his* own *bare word*, without Scripture.

But as the *Proteſtant Anſwerer* argued from the words and phraſes of the Chapter, ſo from the current of our Saviour's Diſcourſe,

Diſcourſe, that it could not be properly and literally underſtood.

(1.) Becauſe then all that properly Eat the Fleſh of Chriſt, would according to our Saviour's promiſe, *v.* 54. *Have Eternal Life*; *Whoſo Eateth*, &c.

To this our Author anſwers, *Very true!* but with a qualification that recalls what he had granted. For it's to be underſtood, ſaith he, of *Worthy Receivers*. But this is by no means conſiſtent with our Saviour's Reaſoning, which if the Fleſh to be eat, and the Eating of it were to be underſtood properly, will neceſſarily infer the Salvation of all ſuch as thus *Eat* after this manner; as well unworthy as worthy. Since all that Eat his Fleſh, and drink his Blood, in the ſenſe there meant, are the perſons to whom Eternal Life is promiſed; but if properly Eating his Fleſh be the ſenſe of our Saviour's Expreſſions there us'd, then we know what follows.

2. The *Proteſtant Anſwerer* urged further, That if the words *Eating the Fleſh*, and *Drinking the Blood*, be properly to be underſtood, then the Receiving the Sacrament in both Kinds will be neceſſary to Salvation; it being affirmed, *v.* 53. *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his Blood, ye have no life in you*; and he ſhewed that for this reaſon, amongſt others, Cardinal *Cajetan* would not admit that this Diſcourſe of our Saviour belong'd to the Euchariſt.

What ſaith our Author to this? Truly nothing. *As to this*, ſaith he, *of both kinds, it doth not properly relate either to your requeſt, or my Anſwer.* A Reply that may be made in any caſe.

He goes on, *And beſides, I do not ſee where the neceſſity lies of defining the Sacrament in both Kinds to one that believes it in neither.* That is, as much as to ſay, I beg his pardon, I will not vouchſafe an Anſwer to ſuch an one as he is; but however, methinks he might have ſaid ſomewhat, if it had been only for the ſatisfaction of the diſtreſſed *Seeker*, to whom he writes his *Letter*; to let him ſee that there is no conſequence in this Argument. It puzled Cardinal *Cajetan*, a man of ſenſe and ſagacity; and ſurely the *Seeker* may then be led away by the error of it, and it may put off his *Declaration for the Catholick Faith* four Months longer. But there is no danger, it was not neceſſary to one that doth not believe; but he declares he *is ready to ſatisfie his Seeker*, that is, one that doth believe, as we may conceive.

I know not whether this may not have put our Author a little out of humour, for he cannot but *abhor*, he ſaith, *to ſee men mould Gods Word into what Form they pleaſe, and make every thing a Figure, that doth not ſquare with their Fancy. Is it becauſe our Saviour ſpake ſome things by way of Parable, that all he ſaid was ſuch? Or that he never ſpake otherwiſe? How comes it that mean Capacities are (by the Church of St.* Martin's*) left to themſelves, to judg of the true ſenſe of Scripture, according to* D. T. *who tells you in his* True Account of a Conference, "*That a man after uſing all Chriſtian Means, and the help of all Miniſterial Guides poſſible, muſt at "laſt judg for himſelf.——A ſpecial Aſſertion indeed! Which if true, what need of Teachers?* &c. *Pag.* 10.

But how doth he *mould* the Word of God into what *Form* he pleaſes, that underſtands that Figuratively which was Figuratively ſpoken? And to whom doth our Author ſpeak when he thus Expoſtulates, *Is it becauſe our Saviour ſpake ſome things by way of Parable, that all he ſaid was ſuch?* Had he no other way to get clear of his Adverſary, but to fix this upon him? And had he no other way to meet with thoſe that plead for the perſpicuity of Scripture, but to tell the world, that they own our Saviour *never ſpake otherwiſe than in Parables?* How mean and ridiculous is this? But however this was a fair occaſion as he thought to make a *ſpecial* Remarque upon the Doctrine taught *by the Church of St. Martin's.* Now here the *Proteſtant Anſwerer* is more immediately concerned as a Pariſhioner (though one of the *Mean Capacities* there *taught*) and would fain ſee how our Author would manage himſelf in a debate upon that Argument; eſpecially when after his Exclamation againſt it, he himſelf is forced to acknowledg the reaſonableneſs of it. For if a man *muſt* not *at laſt judg for himſelf*; or if ſo, that there will be no *need of Teachers*; then it's in vain to ſend *Anſwers* and *Letters* to a *Seeker*, and to propoſe Texts to his Examination: And yet in this *ſpecial* way doth our Author proceed from the beginning to the end of his *Letter.* He leaves it to his *Seeker* to *paſs ſentence upon what has been ſaid by either* party, *Pag.* 1. *Whether*, ſaith he, *this hath any reference, be you the Judg. Pag.* 7, 13. He deſires him *to conſult the words, and ſee whether thoſe Texts do imply,* &c. Pag. 8. *Seriouſly to diſtinguiſh and peruſe the Texts, Pag.* 33. So that it ſeems this *ſpecial Aſſertion* ought to be one of his own, who teaches his *Seeker* ſo far, after the ſame way *as mean Capacities are taught by the Church at St.* Martin's.

To

To come to a cloſe of this Argument; the *Proteſtant Anſwerer* the better to repreſent his Adverſaries weakneſs in decrying *Figures and Parables*, ſhewed him how this Diſcourſe of our Saviour ſo abounded in them, that there were no leſs than twenty expreſſions of that kind in it; and accordingly drew out ſeveral of them for our Author to try his skill upon, and to reſolve them *without a Figure*, Pag. 8. Firſt, ſaith he, *Let the Catholick Anſwerer tell me without a Figure, what is that meat which endures to Everlaſting Life?* Here our Author labours hard to prove that the meat in *v.* 27. is the Bread and Fleſh, *v.* 51. and concludes, *which* Fleſh, *without a Figure, I humbly conceive is that meat which endureth unto Everlaſting Life.* But I as humbly conceive he has not reach'd the point; for granting the Meat, the Bread, and the Fleſh to be one and the ſame, yet how is the Fleſh of Chriſt Bread and Meat without a Metaphor, when it's only ſpiritually and not Corporally Eaten, as he ſaith, and when neither capable of digeſtion, nor we of nouriſhment by it? Again, if this be Eaten only in the Sacrament, how can it under the Form of Bread endure to Everlaſting Life, or how can it be Meat that thus endures, when it is not to be Eaten in Heaven, and all Sacraments and Inſtitutions ceaſe?

The other Queſtions were. *How the Son was ſealed by the Father? How Jeſus is Bread, and the Bread that came down from Heaven? How the Bread and the Fleſh of Chriſt could be the ſame?* v. 57. *And if the ſame, how it could come from Heaven, when he was of the Seed of* David, *according to the Fleſh? How one of his Church can talk of a literal Senſe of,* [*except* ye drink his Blood], *which denies the Cup to the Laity?*

To all theſe our Author returns a general Anſwer, *As to his, How the Son was ſealed by the Father, and the reſt of his* How's? *they are ſuch* Jewiſh *Expreſſions, as that all Chriſtian pretenders ought to be aſhamed of them. So the* Jews *ſaid,* v. 52. *How can this man give us his Fleſh to eat? So* Jewiſh *it is to queſtion God, how he could do it? How this? How that?* And ſo he runs on to the Creation, and Incarnation, *&c.* I am a little at a loſs here, to what cauſe our Authors miſtake is to be aſſign'd? Surely he could not but underſtand that the *How* relates not to the manner, How theſe things be? But, how theſe things could be thus applied to our Saviour without a Figure? I am afraid that he ſaw the difficulty, and ſo ſlipt away from it; for elſe, why ſhould he anſwer directly

directly to the first Query, which would more plausibly bear it; and indirectly and fraudulently to the rest? And yet, as if he had to a Demonstration proved what he had undertaken, and effectually confuted his Adversary, he will still have the words express and plain, without a Figure. For thus he concludes, p. 11. If *these express and plain words of Christ be a Figure, where he says as plain, as plain can be, that* he would give us Bread to eat, which should be his Flesh, [but which I have shewed before, he did not say.] *I say, if these words are Figurative, and must not be properly understood, I see no Reason, why the whole Bible should not be a Figure too. For if ever Christ was plain in any thing, 'twas in this; especially in a Point, wherein there was never more occasion to expound, if a Figure, than when the* Jews *(to whom he came) murmured and said, How can this man give us his Flesh to eat? And when some of the Disciples said it was an hard saying, and thereupon walked no more with him. He that, in cases of less moment always explain'd his Parables, should yet be Dark and Figurative in this of that Importance, and which he well foresaw, occasions our differences at this day; it would be contrary to his Wisdom and Goodness. But so far was Christ from this, that he confirms it*, v. 53. *With a verily, verily, except ye eat the Flesh*, &c.

I have transcribed this the more at large, because it contains some things very peculiar, and is indeed the utmost force of what he hath for his Defence.

I Answer to this.

1. In General, it's manifest, That our Saviour is not literally plain; since it's acknowledg'd that his Discourse is Figurative, from *ver.* 32. to *ver.* 51. And is it not strange, that when he had so long discours'd after that manner, that yet in one verse, he should mean literally, and which if literally understood, would be so manifest a Contradiction to the Sense and Reason of Mankind, that if he had literally said he was *Bread*, he could not have more astonished them, than when he said, *except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man*, &c. if properly and literally to be understood.

2. Whereas he saith our Saviour always explain'd his Parables; that is too largely spoken. For even those, which he chuses out of *Mark* 3. 10, 13, 31, were not expounded to the Multitude; and if his Argument signify any thing, must therefore be properly

properly underſtood by them. But why did not he propound the caſe in Diſpute, and give us a like inſtance in figurative and metaphorical Expreſſions; Such as our Saviour uſes in this Chapter? For, are *Sealing*, *Hungring*, &c. to be underſtood properly, becauſe it's not ſaid, that they are to be underſtood Figuratively? Nay, are eating his *Fleſh*, and drinking his *Blood*, to be underſtood properly? Then certainly, the *Capernaits* were in the right, that thought our Saviour ſpoke of *carnal* Eating, which yet our Author will not allow.

3. He ſaith, *There was never more occaſion to expound, if a Figure, than when the* Jews *murmured, and ſome of his Diſciples went away; and what he ſaw, occaſions our Differences.*

(1.) As for the *murmuring* of the *Jews*, there was no ſuch *occaſion* for our Saviour's expounding it; For thus alſo they murmured, becauſe that Chriſt ſaid, *I am the Bread that came down from Heaven*, v. 41. And yet, tho he took notice of it, *ver.* 43. he thought not himſelf concerned to explain his meaning, where there might be more reaſon for their miſtake, than there could be in this. Indeed our Saviour look'd upon them as an obſtinate and intractable ſort of People, and ſo did purpoſely conceal himſelf often, as was obſerved before, *Mark* 13. And this we are not without ſome light in, in the caſe before us. For this Diſcourſe of his, was in the Synagogue, *v.* 59. and they were the ſame People that before were offended and cavilled, *ver.* 41, 52. And therefore our Saviour left them in the Dark, tho afterwards, when his Diſciples murmured, *v.* 60, 61, 63. he tells them, it was ſpiritually to be underſtood.

(2.) As for thoſe Diſciples, it doth not appear, that they *walked no more with him*, becauſe they were offended at his ſaying, (for that he explain'd it to them) but becauſe he gave an Intimation that he diſcovered their inſincerity, *v.* 64. *There are ſome of you that believe not*; and it follows, *From that time many of his Diſciples went back*, &c.

(3.) Neither was there any ſuch occaſion for our Saviour's expounding himſelf *from our differences*; If he had meant it properly, I grant *there could never be more occaſion*, becauſe it's a Doctrine ſo contrary to the Senſe and Reaſon of Mankind; but when it's not ſo explain'd, the Senſe and Reaſon of Mankind may be thought a ſufficient Security againſt miſtake. And there might be

be as much reaſon for our Saviour to expound himſelf, when he ſaith, he is *Bread*, a *Door*, a *Vine*, a *Rock*.

But all this while, our Author ſuppoſes our Saviour not to have explain'd himſelf. I grant it, he did not do it on their ſide; but I think he has done it to all attentive and unprejudiced minds; if they will either conſult the foregoing part of this diſcourſe, where he ſpeaks of himſelf, under the Alluſions of *Bread* and *Fleſh*, *v.* 33, 35, 48, 51. and of believing in him under the the Metaphors of *Coming* and *Eating*, *v.* 35, 36, 47, 51, 60, 61, 62. or if they conſult the Concluſion, *v.* 63. where he tells his offended Diſciples, *It's the Spirit that quickneth*, &c. As if he had ſaid, The eating my *Fleſh*, and drinking my *Blood*, which I propound to you, is not as thoſe cavilling *Jews* did miſconſtrue it; and as you, I perceive, miſtake; for in that *Fleſh*, I am to aſcend into Heaven; but it's the heeding and obeying my Precepts, the receiving my Doctrine, and believing in me as your Redeemer, that I require, and you are to regard. And indeed, thus St. *Peter* underſtood him, who concludes almoſt in the ſame words, *Lord, to whom ſhall we go? Thou haſt the words of Eternal Life. And we believe*, &c. *v.* 68, 69.

4. He ſaith, That *Chriſt was ſo far from meaning otherwiſe than plainly, as he ſpake, that to the murmuring Jews he confirms it*, v. 53. *with a Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, Except*, &c. *Whereas in Parables he explained himſelf to them.* That is, our Saviour meant plainly, becauſe he did not explain himſelf. But, ſaith he, *he confirmed it.* What did he confirm? Did he confirm the Literal ſenſe? That he did not before give, and ſo could not confirm. Or doth the Repetition of it without Explication ſhew it to be the Literal ſenſe? That he contends for. But then by parity of reaſon our Saviour meant properly, when he ſaid, *I am the Door.* For it's there ſaid in confirmation of what was before: *Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, I am the Door*, Joh. 10. 1, 7. But why did our Saviour repeat it? Without doubt to ſhew that he ſpoke it not inconſiderately; and if I add, to explain what he before ſaid, it's not without ſomewhat in the Text to countenance it. For before he ſpoke of himſelf under the notion of Fleſh, *v.* 51, 52. but then of *Fleſh* and *Blood*, to intimate both the violence and manner of his Death; which he did uſually ſpeak with more caution and reſerve about.

If

If we reflect upon what has been ſaid, we ſee how unwarily (I am loth to add more) our Author delivers himſelf, when he ſaith, *If theſe words are Figurative, I ſee no reaſon why the whole Bible ſhould not be a Figure too.* And *if ever Chriſt was plain in any thing, it was in this.* And, which I cannot recite without ſome indignation; *Should he explain himſelf in matters of leſs weight, and yet be dark in this great concern, is what would be contrary to his wiſdom and goodneſs*, p. 10, 11. So that there ſhall be no ſenſe or perſpicuity in Scripture, nor wiſdom and goodneſs in our Saviour, if their Doctrine be not his, and he be not of the ſame mind with them.

Indeed after all our Author's confidence in this matter, and his queſtioning all things, if this be queſtioned: he determines that which the greateſt Authority in his Church, the Council of *Trent*, would not determine. For when it had been ſharply debated for and againſt theſe words being underſtood of the Euchariſt, it was at laſt agreed for the ſatisfaction of both ſides, neither to affirm nor deny it, and to yield to thoſe that deni'd it, that they had Fathers and Doctors on their ſide. And thus the Council concludes; *However that Diſcourſe* (of our Saviour's, *Joh. 6.*) *be underſtood according to the divers Interpretations of the Holy Fathers and Doctors*, Seſſ 21. c. 1.

Here our Author takes a great leap from *Pag. 9.* of the *Anſwer*, to *Pag. 22.* but becauſe it's not amiſs, I ſhall follow him: The *Proteſtant Anſwerer* put it to them *to give as plain Letter of Scripture to prove Chriſt was neither a Door, Rock, nor Vine, as he could that he was all Three: Or that all Chriſtians are not turn'd into Chriſt's Natural Body, when it's ſaid* Epheſ. 5. 20. *We are members of his Body.* This he did to ſhew that the Phraſes, *Eating the Fleſh*, and, *This is my Body*, were not of themſelves ſufficient to enforce us to take them in a proper ſenſe; ſince it's no more plainly ſaid, *Except ye eat the Fleſh*, &c. and, *This is my Body*; than it's ſaid, *I am the Door*, *The Vine*, &c.

Now what courſe doth our Author take to aſſoil this? *Let's ſee*, ſaith he, *whether the parity 'twixt I am the Door, The Vine*, &c. *be the ſame with, The Bread is my Fleſh, and, This is my Body, without ever explaining a Syllable to the contrary.* Here he is a little too forward. For he is to remember that the thing requir'd is to give as *plain Scripture to prove that Chriſt was neither a Door, nor Vine*, &c. as there is for it. He knows who ſaid it, *I will prove the*

Catholick Doctrine of the Real Preſence, and I defie the world to prove the contrary. Cath. Anſw. to the Seeker. *Pag.* 1. and that declares again, *It's impoſſible to bring one Text out of the whole Bible to prove that the Body and Blood of Chriſt is not in the Sacrament*, Cath. Letter, *Pag.* 24. If now he ſo expects, then it may be ſo expected from him, that he ſhould prove the Negative, and that by as plain a Text he ſhould ſhew Chriſt is not a *Door* or *Vine*, as we can ſhew that he is. I muſt confeſs I put him upon a Ridiculous Task, but who can help it, it's in his own way. But to leave this trifling, let us return to *ſee* his *parity*; though I doubt we ſhan't much better our ſelves. As for the *Door*, he ſaith, *The Text tells us it was a Parable*, Joh. 10. 6. *This Parable ſpake Jeſus. Wherefore if the Proteſtant Anſwerer would be ſo kind, as to produce plain Scripture for this of the Sacrament's being a Figure, as I have done for the Door's being a Parable, he'l certainly gain a Proſelyte of me.* As for gaining him a Proſelyte by *plain* Scripture, I have reaſon to deſpair, who declares beforehand that *though the Scripture were never ſo plain, he would yet ſubmit to the Determination of the Church*, Pag. 4. But where is this *plain Scripture for the Door's being a Parable?* He points to the verſe. But what was the Parable he ſpoke? It's in the Verſes foregoing about a *Door*, I grant; But not of Chriſt's being the Door; for that follows after, *Ver.* 7. *Then ſaid Jeſus unto them again, Verily, verily, I am the Door.* So that if he keeps to his own way *without explaining a Syllable*, he is where he was, and Chriſt may be as properly a door, as we may properly Eat the Fleſh of Chriſt.

He goes on: *In like manner of the Vine, Chriſt ſaith*, Joh. 15. 1. *I am the true Vine, and my Father is the Husbandman, as* Mat. 20. 1. *when he likened the Kingdom of Heaven to an Houſholder; and ſo goes on explaining the ſame*, ver. 4. *As the Branch cannot*, &c. *Which if you read the Chapter, you'l find to be more plain.* I perceive he is very ſerious, and I am of his mind, if the *Seeker* read on, he would find it *plain*, that Chriſt is not properly a Vine, and ſo ſay I, if he reads *Joh.* 6. he would find it as plain, that Eating the Fleſh of Chriſt is not properly to be underſtood. But if words will oblige us without attending the ſenſe, and we muſt take them as we find them *without explaining a Syllable*, then I ſay ſtill it's as plainly ſaid, *I am the true Vine, as my Fleſh is meat indeed*; and according to our Author's way of Expoſition, this can be no Parable. For, ſaith he, *you'l find in all caſes Chriſt ſpake not by Para-*

bles

bles without telling them it was ſo, Pag. 12. But here it's not ſo ſaid; for as before, ſo after the words, *v.* 4. *As the Branch*, &c. he ſaith, *v.* 5. *I am the Vine.*

He goes on: *In like manner of the Reck, That he was the Corner-ſtone, upon which the Foundation was laid*, &c. But how doth he prove Chriſt was not properly a Rock according to his own way? Becauſe, ſaith he, he is a Corner-ſtone, and a Foundation, which is juſt as if he had been asked, how he would prove, *without explaining a Syllable*, Chriſt is not properly a Corner-ſtone, or a Foundation; and he ſhould ſay, becauſe he is a *Rock*. But what ſaith he to the laſt Inſtance, to *prove as plainly, Chriſtians are not turned into Chriſt's Natural Body, when it's ſaid we are members of his Body*, Epheſ. 5. 20? To this an Anſwer is to be expected.

Well, after all his windings and turnings, his *Parities*, and *without explainings*, and his *reading*, and his in *like manners*, and his Rules for underſtanding Parables, the words are as *plain* and *expreſs* that Chriſt is a *Door*, a *Vine*, a *Rock*, and we are *members of Chriſt's Body*, as they are that we *Eat the Fleſh of Chriſt*; and if one be properly to be underſtood, there is as much reaſon from the meer words for the like underſtanding the other.

After this Digreſſion, our Author undertakes the laſt Argument of the *Proteſtant Anſwerer*, viz.

Arg. 3. Here is nothing of the Converſion of the Bread into the Body of Chriſt; but rather the contrary; for if the words are Literally to be underſtood, then they would rather infer the converſion of Chriſt's Fleſh and Blood into Bread and Wine, when he ſaith, *I am the Bread of Life*, v. 5. *My Fleſh is meat* (or Bread) *indeed.*

As to the firſt, which is the converſion of the Bread into the Body of Chriſt, and the chief thing propoſed to him, he hath ſilently paſt it over; perhaps he ſaw here alſo *no neceſſity of defining* or proving *it to one that believes it not.* But to make up this defect he gives his Adverſary a grave Reprimend, that *when he had juſt before ſaid, that theſe words had no ſpecial Reference to the Sacrament, he ſhould now ſo apply them, by an odd way of ſhuffling.* And why did he not as ſharply admoniſh him for offering to ſhew that the words might infer the converſion of Chriſt's

Fleſh into Bread? For both alike belonged to him. Our Author it ſeems apprehended not all this was *Argumentum ad hominem.* But how doth he clear the Point, and ſhew they infer no ſuch converſion? Firſt he ſaith, *for proof whereof,* [That Chriſt's Fleſh is not turn'd into Bread] *let us go to the words of Converſion, This is my Body.* But, methinks, it would have better became him to have firſt proved the Converſion of the Bread into Fleſh from theſe words. As for St. *John*, he grants that had the words been, *My Fleſh is Bread indeed*, as his Adverſary *would fain have them, then he would have ſomething on his ſide.* But if that be the ſenſe of it, and the words Bread and Meat are uſed by our Saviour promiſcuouſly; then it's ſo far acknowledged. And for that I ſhall refer our Author to *v.* 26, 27. but he will not allow *v.* 48. to look that way, nor indeed will I. But yet they will as ſoon prove Chriſt turned into Bread, as the words *the Bread that I will give is my Fleſh*, will prove the Bread turn'd into his Fleſh; which they ſo little do, that they rather would imply the contrary, if underſtood literally, as I have ſhewed *pag.* 8.

But he concludes, *rather than differ, I'le joyn in opinion with the Proteſtant Anſwerer, and theſe other Divines, and with him and them ſubmit to the Determination of the Church.* But where is this the opinion of the *Proteſtant Anſwerer?* Surely our Author is like him in *Ariſtotle*, that where ever he went, fancied he ſaw himſelf. But what need is there to go to the Church in this caſe? For I hope he will think ſenſe and reaſon ſufficient to inſtruct men whether thoſe words will prove that Chriſt was turned into Bread: And we think ſenſe and reaſon as ſufficient to inform them whether the words of our Saviour will prove that Bread was turn'd into Chriſt's Fleſh.

I now thought this matter had been at an end, when the *Proteſtant Anſwerer* paſt from this Argument to the ſecond Text. But our Author has not yet done with him. For he tells us, *There is one Argument yet, on which the Gentleman ſeems much to depend* (pag. 9.) *When he ſays,* "*Since if Chriſt be not, but where he intirely* "*is, then (ſays he) he muſt be eaten intirely, &c. From whence he concludes the not being of Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament, becauſe (as he conceives) he is not there intire, for reaſons (not Scripture) of his own*, p. 14. Bleſs me! thought I, where am I now? in the land of *Oberon?* What ſhall I ſay? he quotes *pag.* 9. I haſtily turn'd thither, and there I was ſatisfied my memory had not yet forſaken

ſaken me. The caſe is thus, the *Anſwerer*, as is before obſerved, to ſhew the abſurdity of our Author's appealing to the mere Letter, put ſeveral Queries to him out of this Chapter, which he deſired him to reſolve in his own way, *without going to Figures*. The laſt of which was this, *how he can literally interpret*, ver. 57. [*He that eateth me*] *that holds "in the Euchariſt is contained the true "Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Je-"ſus Chriſt.—Since if Chriſt be not but where he intirely is, then he muſt be eaten intirely.* This Queſtion amongſt others was there drop'd by our Author; and the reaſon is apparent, for he muſt either have acknowledged that the words *He that eateth me*, muſt be underſtood Figuratively and Spiritually, and not Corporally: Or elſe that the Soul and Divinity of Chriſt muſt be Eaten with his Body: Or that the Soul and Divinity of Chriſt are not in the Euchariſt with his Body. The caſe, I confeſs, is hard to one that has ſomewhat elſe to reſpect than truth; and therefore it became him to be ſilent. But why he ſhould now bring it on the Stage under another guiſe, I can't imagin, when thus to reſume it, and pervert it muſt as much expoſe his inſincerity as the omiſſion of it before, did his inability to anſwer it. The Reader will ſee that the Argument and the concluſion are none of the *Anſwerer*'s; for that Propoſition, *where ever Chriſt is, there he intirely is*, is a principle of our Author's, and which is there made uſe of againſt him that profeſs'd to *believe with the ſame Faith he believes a God, that in the Euchariſt is truly and ſubſtantially contained the true Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, Cath. Anſw. to *Seeker*, p. 4. And where our Author found the Concluſion I know not, for there is nothing in the *Proteſtant Anſwer* like to this, that *from thence concludes the not Being of Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament, becauſe he is not there intire.*

However it may not be amiſs to ſee how our Author relieves himſelf: Saith he, *To which, I anſwer and grant, that Chriſt is not, but where he is intire. And whether Chriſt who is perfect God, may not be intire in the Sacrament, and in many places at one and the ſame time, is the Query? which if fully reſolved, will overthrow all his reaſoning Ware beſides?* Well, how will he prove Chriſt intirely in the Sacrament? That is, *the true Body of Chriſt with the Soul and Divinity.* That was forgot before, and ſo is not to be remembred; but if it may be accepted for a full and intire Anſwer, he will prove his Body *may be* intire in many places at one and the ſame time.

time. What he ſaith of that, belongs to another place, and ſhall there be conſidered, *p.* 29. But what is this to his Soul and Divinity; and to the literal ſenſe of *he that eateth me*, and the Argument the *Anſwerer* preſt upon him? He will be able to anſwer it, when he can prove his Propoſition, that *Chriſt is not, but where he is intire*; for then his Body muſt be Omnipreſent as well as his Divinity, which after all the *may be's*, and his attempts to prove it poſſible for Chriſt's Body to be in many places at one and the ſame time, I ſuppoſe he will have no *allowance* to *publiſh*, if he ſhould have the imprudence to maintain.

SECT. III.

Sect. 3. WE are at length come to his ſecond Text to prove his *Real Preſence*, viz. *This is my Body.* Here the *Proteſtant Anſwerer* ſhew'd how abſurd the direction of the *Seeker* was, that his Anſwerers ſhould produce their Texts, *without troubling themſelves to tell the meaning on't*, becauſe he was certain that the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* could never be the literal *meaning* of thoſe words. As for example, ſaith he, *Where is there one word, that the* [This] *whatever it means, is the true Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of Chriſt, in the ſelf-ſame Subſtance wherein he was born of the Virgin? Where that this true Body and Blood is truly, really and ſubſtantially contained under the Forms of Bread and Wine? Where that the Bread and Wine are upon Conſecration turned into the true Body and Blood of Chriſt?* Let us ſee how our Author replies to this, *p.* 17. *Let us note his Where's. Where, ſays he, is there one word? Where that this true Body and Blood? Where that the Bread and Wine are upon Conſecration, turn'd into the True Body and Blood of Chriſt, &c. Which truly, are Where's indeed?* But what's become of *the Soul and Divinity of Chriſt?* What of *the ſelf-ſame Subſtance wherein he was born of the Virgin?* What of *the true Body, truly, really, and ſubſtantially contain'd under the Forms of Bread and Wine?* Which are what he profeſs'd *firmly and truly to believe by the ſame Faith he believes a God?* And where (to add another *Where*) will he find theſe literally in the words, *This is my Body?* He tells us *one would think that ſo many Where's were not without a Wherefore. And becauſe the Gentleman deſires to know the Where, he ſhall alſo know the When.* Certainly now to the Confutation of *Scotus* and *Biel*, &c. and the confuſion of all Hereticks,

We

We shall have a plain discovery, and that in so many words we shall find *the true Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of Christ*, &c. For this go we to his *when Jesus took Bread*, &c. *and said, This is my Body*, Mat. 26. 26. *Then it was*, saith he, *and, Here it is by power of these words of God, This is my Body, that the Bread is turned into the Body of Christ.* This is indeed a *submission* to the *Seeker*'s direction to produce the *words without a meaning*, and it is so because it is so; *This is my Body*, doth turn the Bread into the Body, because there are the words, *This is my Body.* I hope the Reader is satisfied, for in truth I am.

The next thing proposed by the *Prot. Answerer* was, what the meaning is of *This*, in, *This is my Body?* If, saith he, it be Bread, then the Bread is in the literal sense, the substance of Christ's Body, and so overthrows the change to be made in *Transubstantiation.* If by *This*, is not meant the Bread, then the Bread could never be turned into the Body of Christ by vertue of the words, *This is my Body.* Our Author readily answers, *Ask the Question, What? and our Saviour will resolve you*, Mat. 26. 26. *This is (what?) my Body, he did not say, after he had blessed it, Say, Take, Eat, This is Bread, but my Body; than which, nothing can be more plain, than that it was his Body.* And to make all sure, he seriously proves it, because it's *not* hic, *but* hoc est panis. It's well ἄρτος in the *Greek* is of the same Gender with *panis.* But let us admit of this Learned Criticism (though by the way let me observe for our Author's instruction, when the Article relates to the sentence, it's to be put in the Neuter Gender) the difficulty put, yet remains; for if the *This* relates to Body, then the sense is, This Body is my Body. But saith he, *let us* suppose *This* to refer to *Bread, It yet follows that it is his Body.* But it follows also, as the Answerer argued, that then the Bread is the Substance of Christ's Body according to the Letter; and so could not be turned into it. So that our Author has left the difficulty as he found it.

But because the Answerer here said, *We have not Faith to believe that which the Scripture hath not taught*, he very subtilly argues after this manner: *From whence*, saith he, *I gather, that notwithstanding all his Arguments to disprove the Real Presence, yet he hath not Faith (though face) to deny it. For that* pag. 3. *he tells you that "besides their positive Articles, they have a great many Negative ones,* [and the Answerer tells you, for which we are beholden to the Cor-

Corruptions and Innovations of the Church of *Rome*] &c. *For that he hath not faith to believe, what the Scripture hath not taught, that in the Eucharist is not contain'd the Body of Christ. The Gentleman therefore can have no Faith to deny it.* A very quaint Argument; which I shall dismiss with a parallel Instance. He that hath not Faith to believe that which the Scripture hath not taught, hath not Faith to deny that to be of Faith which the Scripture doth not teach: And therefore because *Mahometism* is not taught in Scripture, he hath not Faith to deny it. But this spirit of acuteness doth not last long, for having labour'd to find inconsistencies in the Doctrine of the Church of *England* as set down in the Answer, he blunders without end. He allows what our Church saith, *That the Body of Christ is eaten in the Sacrament after an Heavenly and Spiritual manner*; but he adds, *but this we believe to be a true and real manner, not a Deceitful, Figurative, or Fictitious manner.* —— *If you grant it after a Spiritual manner, you must grant it there after a true manner. If Christ be there in Spirit, he is also there in Truth; and if there in Spirit and Truth, all my Arguments are granted.* I think not; for the Church of *England* saith, it's *only after an Heavenly and Spiritual manner.* So that though they do agree, where Christ is in Spirit, he is there in Truth; yet I doubt me the word *only* alters the case, for he may be there *in Spirit and in Truth*, and yet not be Corporally there. And I question whether any thing less will satisfie our Author; and so it appears; *For*, saith he, *Christ is there after such an Intire, Real and Substantial manner, as we believe, or he is in no manner there at all*, p. 19, 20.

PART II. Sect. 1.

Part 2. Sect. 1.

HAving thus considered the Texts produced by the *Catholick Answer to the Seeker*, and shew'd how little they serve their Cause; I shall proceed to the Second Part, and that is to vindicate the Texts produced in the *Protestant Answer*, from the Exceptions of our Author. Here our Author sets his Texts against those of the Protestant; but it would have done well if he had first set down what it is he should prove on his own side, *viz.* That *in the Eucharist is truly, really and substantially contained, under the*

the Forms of Bread and Wine, the true Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of Chriſt in the ſame ſubſtance wherein he was born of the Virgin, and wherein he lived and died for us; and this by the Converſion of the whole Bread into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood of Chriſt. If this had been done, how meanly would it have look'd, though he brought his 24 Texts to prove it? and ſurely he could not then have had the confidence to have ſaid, as he now doth, *I doubt not but it appears that the Texts brought on the Catholick* [Roman] *ſide are abundantly plain and ſufficient for the Being of Chriſt's Body in the Sacrament*, as thus ſet down. And it would doubtleſs have been ſome gratification to his Reader, if he had given us a Paraphraſe as his Adverſary had done, according to theſe his Sentiments.

But here he ſaith that the Anſwerer *pretends not to prove by theſe Texts that the Body and Blood of Chriſt are not in the Sacrament*, p. 24 Why ſo? Becauſe it's one of their Negative Articles, and to "require plain and expreſs words of Scripture to prove ſuch a "thing is not there taught, is, ſays he, to demand a proof, the thing is not capable of.——As if ſuppoſe there was not *expreſs words of Scripture* to confute *Arianiſm*, therefore that could not be confuted by Scripture. It's enough that what is not in Scripture is no Article of Faith; it's enough that there are ſuch Propoſitions in Scripture as are ſufficient to refute it, though there ſhould not be *expreſs words*. But however if he will take it in the words of our Article, and if it may be to his content, we ſhall find it poſitively ſaid that *Tranſubſtantiation is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture*. And we have our Author acknowledging that his Adverſary undertakes to ſhew that the Proteſtants have the Letter of Scripture for them, *meaning* (as he ſaith) *that in the Sacrament is Not contained the Body of Chriſt*, p. 30. And now let us try whether the *Anſwerer* did not give them more than his *bare word* for it; in the uſe he made of his own Quotations. As he obſerved from thence.

SECT. II.

1. THat it's no contradiction to our Saviour's manner of ſpeaking, to interpret theſe words Figuratively, ſince our Author after all his Exclamations of *giving Chriſt the Lie*, is forced Sect. 2.

(tho here he ſlips over it)-elſewhere to acknowledg that the Cup, yea and the word *Bread*, is ſo uſed, *p.* 28.

2. That in many Inſtances the Letter of Scripture is for us: As,

Arg. 1. That there is no Subſtantial change in the Elements, but they remain the ſame Bread and Wine after Conſecration as before. So it's five times call'd *Bread*, 1 Cor. 10. 26, *&c.* and the whole Solemnity is call'd *Breaking of Bread*, Act. 2. 42.

To this our Author replies ſeveral ways, as, *By the word Bread*, ſaith he, *is meant the Communion of the Body of Chriſt, as by the word* Cup *is ſignified the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt*, p. 24.

But to this I anſwer,

1. That if the words *Bread* and *Cup* are not to be underſtood Literally, but with a thereby *is meant*, and thereby *is ſignified*, then there is no more reaſon from the bare words to underſtand, *This is my Body* Literally: And that it may be as well interpreted, This is the Repreſentation, and Sign of my Body, as this Bread is the Communion of my Body.

2. From hence it follows, That if the Bread be the Communion of the Body of Chriſt, as the Cup is the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt, then the Bread is no more changed than the Cup; but as the Cup remains the Cup, ſo the Bread remains the Bread in the Communion.

3. If the Bread be the Communion of the Body of Chriſt, then the Communion of the Body of Chriſt is in the Communion of the Bread; and ſo the Bread is ſtill Bread.

4. Our Author has not touched the Point, which was to ſhew the Letter of Scripture is for us, when it calls it Bread after Conſecration.

But he ſaith, *Saint* Paul *mentions not the words*, Cup *and* Bread, *but he explains them to be the Body and Blood of Chriſt*, 1 Cor. 11. 26. *As often as ye eat this Bread, ye do ſhew the Lords death, which was not ſhewn, but by offering up his True and Real Body and Blood.*

I anſwer, ſo we may better ſay he mentions not the Body of Chriſt, but he explains it, when he five times afterwards calls it Bread: But how doth the *ſhewing of the Death* of Chriſt prove the Bread to be his Body, when it rather proves it not to be his Body, becauſe his Body is not, according to them, viſible, and to be *ſhewn?*

He ſaith further, *How could they be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*, v. 27. *if the Body and Blood be not there?* I an-

I anſwer, As perſons may be guilty of it out of the Sacrament: Thus we read *Heb.* 6. 6. *Who crucifie to themſelves the Son of God afreſh.* And *Chap.* 10. 29. *Who trod under foot the Blood of the Covenant.* And ſo by unworthy receiving of the Lords Supper, in which his Death was Commemorated and Repreſented, they after the ſame manner were by Interpretation guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord. And this the next *ver.* 29. ſhews, *not diſcerning the Lords Body*; which can be underſtood only of a Spiritual diſcerning by Faith. Or rather as the word διακρίνων ſignifies, *diſcriminating.*

Laſtly, he adds, *'Twould be hard a Sinner ſhould be damn'd meerly for moderate eating and drinking Wine; for according to the Proteſtant Anſwerer, the Sacrament is no more, who tells you,* p. 11. *There is no other Subſtance diſtributed among the Communicants, than that of Bread and Wine.*

1. But if our Author had gone three or four Lines further, he would have found thoſe words, *pag.* 11. *The Body of Chriſt is not otherwiſe preſent than it is eaten, that is, after an Heavenly and Spiritual Manner, in the Spiritual Bleſſings and effects of his Merits and Sufferings in his Body, to thoſe that believe.* So that he prevaricates, when he ſaith, *Sinners are damn'd meerly for moderate eating and drinking,* and that we eſteem the *Sacrament no more.*

2. We look upon it as a *Divine Inſtitution, and by virtue of that Inſtitution a means of Grace; and that by a worthy participation of it, we partake of that Grace which is thereto promiſed, therein exhibited, and thereby conveighed,* as it's there declared, *p.* 17. and conſequently the damnation threatned is to the contempt of God's Ordinance, and of the Sufferings of Chriſt therein repreſented, and of the Grace of God purchaſed by thoſe Sufferings, and therein to be obtained.

The *Anſwerer* ſhew'd, alſo as the Bread, ſo the Wine was without alteration, from *Mat.* 26. 28. who after he had ſaid, *This is my Blood,* calls it the *Fruit of the Vine.* And from the order in St. *Mark* 14. 23, 24. where the Apoſtles are ſaid to have drank of it, before our Saviour ſaid, *This is my Blood.*

This Branch of the Argument our Author divides from the other, and caſts it forward three or four Pages, *Pag.* 28. for it gave too much light to the other, whilſt they were together.

As to the former Text, *I will not drink of the fruit of the Vine,*

he ſaith, *St.* Luke *gives the plaineſt order of it*, Chap. 22. 14. *and that there it has relation to the Paſchal Cup.*

I grant, that in St. *Luke* it more immediately is joyn'd to the Paſchal Feaſt, but yet in St. *Matthew* and *Mark*, Chriſt is ſaid to have ſpoke theſe words after the delivery of the Cup in the Lords-Supper. And the leaſt that can be obſerved from hence is, that it was indifferently to be applied to either; and ſo it more ſtrongly argues that it was alike to be underſtood [that the Wine in the Euchariſtical Cup was the natural fruit of the Vine, as that in the Paſchal] as that the ſubſtance of both was one and the ſame, and no more change in the one than the other.

But, *ſuppoſe this, yet*, ſaith he, *the meaning of theſe words could in no wiſe be applied to the Subſtance of Wine proceeding from an Earthly Vine; but to the Subſtance of his Blood, the fruit of the Heavenly Vine, for that it was to be drank new with them in his Father's Kingdom, which is Heaven, where they neither keep Taverns, nor drink Wine, &c.*

Some perſons while they charge others with irreverence, themſelves ſeem to have loſt all due reverence for holy things.

We will ſuppoſe, in favour of our Author, that by *the Kingdom of God* our Saviour means Heaven, and by the *Fruit of the Vine*, he means the Subſtance of Chriſt's Blood; yet how will it follow that it's the ſame Fruit of the Vine they drink of in Heaven as they drank of in the Sacrament; ſince the Blood of Chriſt is no more drank in Heaven, than Wine; nor is the Sacrament any more adminiſtred there, than the Paſſover? So that if by the Kingdom of God, Heaven is to be underſtood, then the phraſe, *Till I drink it new*, ſignifies Myſtically and Figuratively according to the manner of Scripture, which ſets forth the happineſs of that ſtate by eating, *Mat.* 8. 11. *Luk.* 14. 15. and the excellency and perfection of it by the word *New*, Revel. 14. 13, *&c.* And ſo the meaning is, I ſhall not henceforth thus eat with you; the next Feſtival I ſhall obſerve, will be in Heaven; there we that have now thus eat and drank together, ſhall partake of the felicity of that ſtate; and this fruit of the Earthly Vine ſhall be exchanged for Rivers of Heavenly Pleaſures, which we ſhall there be entertained with.

The next thing obſerved by the *Anſwerer* in proof of the Subſtance of the Wine continuing ſo after Conſecration, was from the order obſerved in St. *Mark* 14. 23. where it's ſaid the Diſciples

ciples drank of the Wine, before our Saviour ſaid, *This is my Blood.*

Here our Author thinks himſelf excus'd from an Anſwer, becauſe of an Error in the Preſs, *Body* being put for *Blood.* But if he turned to the Text, he might ſee that place was quoted right, and common ſenſe would ſerve to rectifie it. However he courteouſly offers ſomewhat in the mean time, by way of Anſwer, viz. *Whether St.* Mark *expreſſeth the words in the ſame order as they were ſpoken or no, it matters not; ſeeing he has the Subſtance of what was ſaid, and wherein they all agree; to wit, that it was his Blood. And it's alſo apparent that Chriſt firſt gave thanks, and bleſſed it, before he gave it*, &c. *pag.* 29. But doth it not matter whether St. *Mark* expreſſeth the words in order? Certainly if the order he recites it in, were the order obſerved by our Saviour, and that the Apoſtles received the Cup, and drank of the Wine before *the words of Converſion* (as they call them) were uſed, then it follows (as the *Anſwerer* argued) that they only drank of the Subſtance of the Wine, and that the words, *This is my Blood*, could not ſignifie, and much leſs produce a Converſion of the Wine into the Blood of Chriſt. This our Author was ſenſible of, and therefore in his Anſwer left out the main part of it. For what tho all the Evangeliſts agree that the words, *This is my Blood*; were then uſed by our Saviour? What though *Chriſt firſt gave thanks, and bleſſed it, before he gave it*, if he did not alſo uſe the words of Converſion, *before he gave it?* For all the reſt he might do, and yet the Wine be Wine ſtill (as they own.) But thus it was, if St. *Mark* is right in the order, and it ſeems to be the proper order, becauſe he only ſpeaks of the particular, *that they all drank of it.* But we are not to have any thing to the purpoſe *till* (as he ſaith) *the Bill be amended*, and that I take for his beſt Anſwer.

Arg. 2. The *Proteſtant Anſwerer* ſhewed the Letter of Scripture is for us, that our Saviour's Body had the natural and inſeparable Properties of a Body, ſuch as Extenſion, Circumſcription, *&c. p.* 15. Here our Author calls in the Faith of a Chriſtian, and the Almighty Power of God to his Succour; and looks upon the *Anſwerer* as a ſecond *Didymus*, becauſe he will, like him, *not believe except he ſees*; and *worſe* than him, *who ſaw but the Humanity, yet believed the Divinity of Chriſt*, p. 30. But why all this, when he believes all the Scripture teaches, and reaſon it ſelf juſtifies?

May

May not a man believe, unleſs he believes contrary to what he himſelf ſees, and the Scripture teaches? Or why is he *worſe* than *Thomas*, when *Thomas* would not believe unleſs he ſaw? But the *Anſwerer* is one of thoſe (Thanks be to God) whom our Saviour pronounced Bleſſed, *That have not ſeen, and yet have believed.* What is there he would have him believe? It is what was never put to *Thomas*, for our Saviour convinced him by an ocular Demonſtration, *Joh.* 20. 27. *Reach hither thy finger, and behold,* &c. As much as if he had ſaid, The Reſurrection is real, for it's a real Body that is before thee; and it's my Body, for *reach hither thy finger,* &c. It's plain our Saviour here thought he gave an unqueſtionable Proof of the Truth of his Reſurrection by ſhewing his Body to *Thomas*, which could not have been, had not his Body had the properties of an human body, without which it could not have been a Body; or which if it had been without, *Thomas* could not have been convinced in that way, that it was his Body.

But our Author here undertakes to prove, that this was not the Condition of our Saviour's Body; or, that he could by his power ſeparate theſe eſſential Properties of a Body from his Body. Here I muſt confeſs my ſelf indebted to him for an anſwer to what he offered to this purpoſe before, but not to the purpoſe of the Argument there, and here repeats. *Pray,* ſaith he, *how was his Body to be ſeen, Extended, Finite, and Circumſcribed, when he paſs'd through Walls and Doors that were cloſe?* John 20. 17. *He entred the room, the Doors being ſhut.* —— *How came he through? Was his Body Intire, Extended, Finite, and Circumſcribed with Limbs, Bones, and Sinews?* —— *Such is the Infinite Power of God, that though they were incloſed in walls every where a Mile thick, 'twould yet be poſſible for Chriſt to enter intire through all,* p. 15.

Here is one thing omitted, and that is to prove, that as the Doors were ſhut, when they aſſembled, *for fear of the Jews* (as the Evangeliſt ſaith) ſo they were not opened by Chriſt, when he came and ſtood in the midſt of them; till which be proved, we ſhall ſay the letter of Scripture is for us, and that Chriſt's Body had Fleſh and Bones, might be beheld and felt, and did neither come through the Walls, nor indeed could do, ſo long as it remains true that the Penetration of Dimenſions is impoſſible. But I had need to recal this; for I am for ever ſilenced if what he ſaith be true, that the *Anſwerer argues perfidiouſly of Chriſt, as if he were not God, not diſtinguiſhing betweeen his Glorious Body and ours;*

for

for as God, all things are poſſible to him. But where is that *perfidiouſneſs*, ſince no more is denied to Chriſt, than is to God? For becauſe all things are poſſible to God, doth he think that it's *perfidious* to ſay, that it's not poſſible for God to be ignorant or unfaithful, or circumſcrib'd, and ſo to exiſt after the manner of a Body? Or doth he think it's *perfidious* to ſay, it's impoſſible to make the Body of Chriſt to have been exiſtent in different times, and really to have been exiſtent before it was exiſtent, and yet not to be exiſtent till it was? Or is it *perfidious* to ſay, it's impoſſible to make the circumſcribed Body of Chriſt to be Omnipreſent? The laſt he ſeems to affirm by his often repeated Maxim, That *Chriſt is not but where he is intire, and placing thereon* the Difference between *Chriſt's Glorious Body and ours.* But of that more anon.

Our Author, as he would prove the Body of Chriſt might loſe all the Properties of a Body, ſo alſo that it might be *contained under the Forms of Bread and Wine*, that is, to all appearance it might have all the Properties of thoſe Elements, and yet be none of them, but the Body of Chriſt alone. And this he reaſons upon, after this manner, *Where is the difficulty to believe but this may be, as the Holy Ghoſt under the Form of a Dove, with Feather, Beak, Wing, and all the properties of a Fowl? Or in the Form of Tongues of Fire? Both which to our eyes were but as a perfect Dove, and as perfect Tongues; yet thoſe different objects to the eye of Fleſh, were but one Holy Ghoſt to the Eye of Faith. Therefore nothing can be more plain than that Objects may be one thing to the Eye of Fleſh, and another thing to the Eye of Faith. So in the Sacrament, to our ſight and taſt is plain Bread and Wine, but to our Faith (in Gods word) it is the Real and Intire Body and Blood of Chriſt.*

An inſtance and inference not at all to the purpoſe. For the Queſtion is not, Whether a Spiritual Being may not be under the appearance of a Body? for ſo it was with the Angels when they appeared as men, and the Holy Ghoſt when it appeared like a Dove. Neither is the Queſtion, whether an Object may be one thing to the *eye of Fleſh*, and another to the *eye of Faith*? for ſo our Saviour appear'd to be man, and yet was God as well as man. All which yet is beſides the matter, for in theſe caſes there is an inviſible Being under a viſible repreſentation, or an Inviſible Being in union to a viſible. But here are two objects viſible in their own nature, *viz.* the Body of Chriſt, and Bread; and the one of theſe ſo turn'd into the other, that there are all the Properties of a viſible Being, which

which is not there, *viz.* Bread; and none of the properties of that visible Being which is there, *viz.* the Body of Christ. So that the question should be thus propos'd, Whether what is an object of sense, may have all the properties of another sensible object, without being that thing which they are the properties of; and none of the properties belonging to its own nature and being?

Arg. 3. The *Protestant Answerer* shew'd, that the Letter of Scripture is for us, that the Body of Christ as it ascended, so is to continue in Heaven till the conclusion of the world; and so cannot be in Heaven and Earth at the same time. This our Author calls a *barren conceit*; but as *barren* as it is, it is true, and has Scripture and Reason on its side, notwithstanding what he has objected to the contrary. The first Argument he offers in Answer to this is, *that he is a perfect and omnipotent God.* And that he may be, and yet not reconcile contradictions (as has been just before shewed.) He confirms it by Scripture, *Mat.* 18. 20. *c.* 28. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. And if there, he is there intire, or not at all, p.* 15. *&* 32. But when Christ promised to be in the midst of them, did he promise to be there Corporally? If bodily, I would fain know under what Form he is there? And if he be *intire* where ever he is, and yet he is every where as God, then the Body of Christ must be as Omnipresent as his Divinity; and so there would be no need, nor indeed possibility of his *Descending.*

He adds, *Our Saviour is not so confined in Heaven, as that he cannot also be upon Earth; for we read that he Descended and overthrew* Saul *in the way to* Damascus, *and spoke to him,* Act. 9. 4. *And he may be actually present without being seen, for the men with* Saul *saw no man,* v. 7. *By all which it's plain, that Christ may be in Earth, and in many places at the same time, as well as in Heaven.*

But to this I answer, (1.) It's not certain that the Apostle saw, or that Christ appeared to his *Fleshly eye.* For elsewhere he is said to see him in a *trance,* Act. 22. 17. and here *v.* 4. to *fall on the Earth*; and so God is said to be seen, when yet there was no similitude, *Exod.* 24. 10. *Deut.* 4. 12.

(2.) If he was seen bodily, yet it's not said, as our Author would have it, that he *Descended,* and was bodily present.

But it might be as with St. *Stephen,* who *looked up to Heaven, and saw Jesus standing on the right hand of God,* Act. 7. 55. And so here

v. 3.

v. 3. it's ſaid, that *there ſhined round about (St.* Paul*) a light from Heaven.*

(3.) Much leſs is there ſo much as any intimation of what our Author ſaith, that Chriſt was *Bodily in Heaven and the Earth at the ſame time.* For if he was in in the one, it's certain he was not Bodily in the other. And this our Author unwittingly acknowledges, when he ſaith *Chriſt deſcended and overthrew Saul.* So *Vigilius Tapſitanus, When the Body of Chriſt was in the Earth, it was not in Heaven; and now becauſe it is in Heaven, 'tis not in the Earth.*

Arg. 4. The Anſwerer argued on, That the Letter is for us, that Chriſt was but once offered as a Propitiatory Sacrifice, *&c.* that his Body is Glorified, and ſo not to be offer'd, *Heb.*9.28, *&c.* But to this our Author has made no Reply.

SECT. III.

FRom hence the *Prot. Anſwerer* proceeded to ſhew, that as the Letter of Scripture is for us, ſo are the words which are Figurative, as in thoſe, *This is my Body*, p.16. The method was here orderly and diſtinct, but our Author runs one into another. I ſhall gather up what he ſaith as well as I can. The Arguments by which the *Anſwerer* proved thoſe words to be *Figurative*, are as followeth.

Arg. 1. From the word *This*, which if to be underſtood of the Bread, *Bellarmine* grants, then the word *Body* muſt be *Figuratively* underſtood. And that it was the Bread, at leaſt in conjunction with the other acts relating to it, the *Anſwerer* ſhew'd, which our Author lets paſs.

*Arg.*2. The *Anſwerer* argues, if the words are to be underſtood literally and properly, when theſe words were ſaid by our Saviour, then the Body would be broken, before it was broken.

To this our Author anſwers, (1.) *P.* 26. *Though his Natural Body be there, yet the manner of it's Being is Spiritual and Sacramental, and the manner of its Breaking follows the manner of its Being; his Body is there Broken in the Sign, not the Subſtance.*

I anſwer, That to ſpeak of a Body's being after the manner of

a Spirit, is as much as to say on the contrary, A Spirit exists after the manner of a Body: that is, That Body may be a Spirit, and a Spirit a Body.

2. If the Body be in the manner of its Being only Spiritual and Sacramental, and the breaking in the manner of its breaking be only Spiritually, then why not the Body be only Spiritual and Sacramental? Or why should we any more *profess our selves Jews or Infidels* (as he would have it) *to doubt, whether, nay to affirm, what Christ said was improper* and Metaphorical, when we say, *This is my Body* is to be understood Figuratively and Spiritually, than it's to say (as he doth) it's broken Spiritually; since, as the *Answerer* observ'd it's as well said, *This is broken, as This is my Body*: And our Author saith, *the manner of its being and breaking, are Spiritual and Sacramental, Mystical and Representative?*

3. But this is besides the case; for the Question is not about the manner of Breaking, but how Christ could say, This is Broken (if not Figuratively understood) before it was broken. But to this we are to expect an Answer.

But he adds (2.) *Moreover these words* [*which is broken*] *do prove (as the Holy Catholick Church always did, and ever will hold) it to be a true, proper Sacrifice; for the being broken, explains the Nature of a Sacrifice, which imports the destruction of the thing offered, if corruptible and liable to destruction: But the Body of Christ being Incorruptible and Immortal, can't be really hurt, therefore the manner of breaking, is only Mystical and Representative.*

Setting aside that what he saith concerning the Catholick Church, is spoken Gratis; I answer, If the nature of a Sacrifice *imports the destruction of the thing offered, if corruptible and liable to destruction*, then the Body of Christ must have been destroy'd (if a *proper Sacrifice*) before it was destroy'd; for the Body of Christ (when Christ spoke these words, *This is my Body*) was certainly *liable to destruction*. And so he has fastned the Objection, instead of answering it.

(3.) He concludes, *If this manner of Breaking, pleases not the Gentleman* (as in truth it doth not, and he has now given his Reasons for it) *let us see whether the Body of Christ were not otherwise Broke before he instituted the Sacrament. Now his Body was pierced, and Blood spilt at his Circumcision, followed by unspeakable Pains, restless Labours, &c. What his Agony in the Garden? What his being crowned with Thorns and Bloody Whipping at the Pillar?——Wherefore*

fore with Truth our Saviour might have ſaid of his Body [*which is broke*] *without ſuppoſing any thing improper or untrue.*

1. What doth our Author mean when he ſaith he would *ſee, Whether the Body of Chriſt were not otherwiſe broken before he inſtituted the Sacrament:* And inſtances in his *Agony in the Garden, his crowning with Thorns, and whipping?* Doth he think theſe were before the Sacrament?

2. If this was the meaning of our Saviour, when he ſaid, *This is my Body which is broken*, that he was Circumciſed, and in an Agony, *&c.* then where is the Sacrifice, which he ſaith, *imparts the deſtruction of the thing?* Which theſe things were neither literally nor myſtically.

Arg. 3. The Anſwerer urged, that Jeſus himſelf then took the Bread, *&c.* when he ſaid, *This is my Body*, and yet Jeſus had at that time a Body which was not broken, *&c.* no not ſo much as myſtically. So that the ſame Body was whole and broken. Here our Author is ſilent.

Arg. 4. He argued from the words, *Do this in Remembrance of me*, which ſuppoſes abſence; and therefore an Inſtitution ſet up in remembrance, and yet in which the Body was to be actually preſent, is to ſuppoſe the Body to be abſent and preſent at the ſame time.

To this he anſwers.

1. *That thoſe words no way relate to the Laity, who only receive the Sacrament, but to the Prieſts, who conſecrate and adminiſter, for it's no where ſaid, This Eat, This Take, This Receive, but, This Do.*

A. 1. If this be ſo, then there is no command to the People to receive.

2. To whom did the Apoſtle write his Epiſtle, but to Laity as well as Prieſts.

3. Surely he did not read 1 *Cor.* 11.24. where the Apoſtle ſaith, *Take, Eat, This is my Body. This do*; What? but, Take, Eat; ſo v. 25. *This do ye, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me. This do:* What? but, *Drink this.*

But after all, what is this to the Argument? For whether theſe Words were ſpoke to the Laity or Prieſts, relates not to the Caſe; but the Queſtion is, Whether Remembrance of Perſons, is in its true Notion conſiſtent with Preſence?

To this he answers,

The Seeker unanswerably observed, that the Remembrance of its Being, doth no way make it cease to be. A wise Observation! But what then? Doth it not suppose the Absence of the thing?

This he saith is a *weak piece of Sophistry, as if,* saith he, *my Remembrance of your being with me, when Present, did any wise suppose your Absence from me.*

But I thought, with the rest of Mankind, that Remembrance and Sight are as distinct in their notion, as Absence and Presence; and that I may as well see what is Absent, as remember what is Present: What is Present we see and know, but what is Unseen and Absent, we remember.

After all, we see that the Author has left no Rule to direct a true *Seeker* to, no Guide to direct him, no Arguments to settle his wavering mind; and if there be not a better Rule, Guide, or Arguments than he has offered toward his Conviction, there is no help for it, but the *Seeker* must live and dye a *Seeker*.

It's impossible to convince a man that has Sense and Reason, that he must not use them, and that whatever use they may be of in Temporal Matters, they ought to be of none in Religion: and he that will undertake this difficult task, must either prove he doth not contradict himself when he will shew and refer him to the Letter of Scripture, and wish him to use his Eyes to see it, And his reason to judg of it; or else he must prove that both parts of a Contradiction may be true. And having brought our Author hither, I may safely leave him, and conclude his Argument, together.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAg. 10. lin. 21. for *Seeker pag.* 6. [Seeker pag. 6.] with Braces. P. 27. l. 32. for *who* r. *where.*

ADVERTISEMENT.

Transubstantiation contrary to Scripture; or the Protestant's Answer to the Seeker's Requeſt.

An Apology for the Pulpits; being in Answer to a late Book, Intituled, *Good Advice to the Pulpits.* Together with an Appendix, containing a Defence of Dr. *Tenison's* Sermon about Alms; in a Letter to the Author of this Apology.

285229